

Officer History

Officer Name: JENDZO, PHILIP

Tax ID: 966640

Sex: M

Shield: 25651

Race: White

Rank: PO

Command: 101

Birth Year: [REDACTED]

Appt Date: 10/24/2018

Age: [REDACTED]

Tenure: 3

CCRB #	CMD	Incident Date	Reported Date	Allegation	Allegation Disposition	Board Discipline Recommendation*	NYPD Allegation Disposition	NYPD MOS Penalty
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]			
202100297	101	01/01/2021	01/13/2021	OPMN - Failure to prepare a memo book entry	OPMN			
202105373	101	09/03/2021	09/09/2021	Force - Physical force Discourtesy - Action				
				Total Charges = 4	Total Cases = 3			

*Board Discipline Recommendations were not issued for complaints closed prior to the CCRB's adoption of the NYPD's Disciplinary Matrix on 03/15/2021. With the adoption of the NYPD Disciplinary Matrix, CCRB now issues a Board Discipline Recommendation for officers that is separate and apart from the disposition of the allegations substantiated against the officer.

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: ██████ Talisayan	Team: Squad #11	CCRB Case #: 202100297	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Force <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt. <input type="checkbox"/> U.S. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse <input type="checkbox"/> O.L. <input type="checkbox"/> Injury	
Incident Date(s) Friday 01/01/2021 3:20 AM Friday 01/01/2021 3:51 AM	18 Mo. SOL 07-01-2022 07-01-2022	EO SOL 07-01-2022 07-01-2022	Location of Incident: Corner of Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street; 101st Precinct stationhouse	Precinct: 101
Date/Time CV Reported Wed, 01/13/2021 7:03 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Wed, 01/13/2021 7:03 PM	

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
1. ██████ ██████	Comp/Victim	██
2. ██████ ██████	Victim	██

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POF ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT
2. Officers			
3. POM ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT
4. POM Philip Jendzo	25651	966640	101 PCT
5. SGT ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT
6. POM ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. POM ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT
2. POM ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT
3. POM ██████ ██████	██████	██████	101 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A . POF ██████ ██████	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ refused to provide her name to ██████ ██████	A . Unfounded
B . POM ██████ ██████	Discourtesy: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ spoke discourteously to ██████ ██████	B . Unfounded
C . POM ██████ ██████	Force: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ used physical force against ██████ ██████	C . Unfounded
D . POM ██████ ██████	Force: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ hit ██████ ██████ against a vehicle.	D . Unfounded
E . POM ██████ ██████	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ damaged ██████ ██████ property.	E . Unsubstantiated
F . POM ██████ ██████	Force: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer ██████ ██████ used physical force against ██████ ██████	F . Unsubstantiated

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
G . POF [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was an occupant.	G . Exonerated
H . POM [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was an occupant.	H . Exonerated
I . Officers	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, officers searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was an occupant.	I . Exonerated
J . POF [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] questioned [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	J . Exonerated
K . POF [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to provide [REDACTED] [REDACTED] with a business card.	K . Substantiated
L . POF [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Abuse of Authority: At the 101st Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] refused to provide her name to [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	L . Exonerated
M . SGT [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Sergeant [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.	M . Other Possible Misconduct
N . POM [REDACTED] [REDACTED]	Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Police Officer [REDACTED] [REDACTED] failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.	N . Other Possible Misconduct
O . POM Philip Jendzo	Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Police Officer Philip Jendzo failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.	O . Other Possible Misconduct

Case Summary

On January 13, 2021, [REDACTED] filed this complaint online with the CCRB.

On January 1, 2021, at approximately 3:20 a.m., Mr. [REDACTED] parked their vehicle at the corner of Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street in Queens. His girlfriend, [REDACTED] was in the front passenger's seat. PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] of the 101st Precinct approached the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] asked Mr. [REDACTED] for his driver's license, registration, and insurance card. Mr. [REDACTED] asked for PO [REDACTED] name, and she allegedly did not provide it to him (**Allegation A: Abuse of Authority, Unfounded**). PO [REDACTED] instructed Mr. [REDACTED] to exit the vehicle and allegedly used profanity while asking him to step out (**Allegation B: Discourtesy, Unfounded**). PO [REDACTED] opened the driver's door of the vehicle and allegedly pulled Mr. [REDACTED] out by his shirt and pushed him against the vehicle (**Allegations C and D: Force, Unfounded**). PO [REDACTED] and PO Philip Jendzo, also of the 101st Precinct, began rear handcuffing Mr. [REDACTED]. While handcuffed, Mr. [REDACTED] tried to hold onto his phone, the title deed, and the bill of sale of the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] allegedly removed the deed and phone from Mr. [REDACTED] hands, causing the title deed and bill of sale to tear (**Allegation E: Abuse of Authority, Unsubstantiated**). PO [REDACTED] kicked Mr. [REDACTED] by his left ankle (**Allegation F: Force, Unsubstantiated**). Mr. [REDACTED] was handcuffed and placed into a police vehicle for transport to the 101st Precinct stationhouse.

PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] and unidentified police officers searched Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle, including its trunk (**Allegations G, H, and I: Abuse of Authority, Exonerated**). As PO [REDACTED] searched the vehicle, she questioned Ms. [REDACTED] and asked her for the location of the marijuana (**Allegation J: Abuse of Authority, Exonerated**). PO [REDACTED] failed to provide Ms. [REDACTED] a business card at the end of their interaction (**Allegation K: Abuse of Authority, Substantiated**). PO Jendzo and PO [REDACTED] also of the 101st Precinct transported Mr. [REDACTED] to the 101st Precinct stationhouse.

At the 101st Precinct stationhouse, Mr. [REDACTED] asked PO [REDACTED] for her name. PO [REDACTED] stated that it was on the summons. Mr. [REDACTED] allegedly could not read it because it was in script (**Allegation L: Abuse of Authority, Exonerated**).

Sgt. [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo failed to prepare memo book entries for this incident (**Allegations M, N, and O: Other Possible Misconduct Noted**).

The investigation obtained body-worn camera footage (BWC) from the following officers from the 101st Precinct: PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO Jendzo, PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and Sgt. [REDACTED].

The investigation obtained cellphone footage recorded by Ms. [REDACTED].

Mr. [REDACTED] was arrested and issued the following summonses during the incident: summonses # 44489927 for unlawful possession of marijuana, # 4448449900 for engine idling for more than three minutes, # 4448449913 for violent and threatening behavior [Board Reviews 01, 02, 03]. Ms. [REDACTED] was not issued summonses or arrested during the incident.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation (A) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] refused to provide her name to [REDACTED]

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 04] captures her entire interaction with Mr. [REDACTED]. From 01:12 to 04:08, PO [REDACTED] greets Mr. [REDACTED] as he lowers his window. She asks for his driver's license, registration, and insurance. Mr. [REDACTED] asks for an explanation for the stop. PO [REDACTED] says that the vehicle is idling. She asks for his documentation again. Mr. [REDACTED] tells her that it is New Year's and asks if the officers are bored. PO [REDACTED] requests his documentation again. Mr. [REDACTED] provides an identification card to PO [REDACTED]. She states that it belongs to Ms. [REDACTED] and asks for Mr. [REDACTED] driver's license. Mr. [REDACTED] says that he lost it. Mr. [REDACTED] eventually provides identification to PO [REDACTED]. She walks away from the vehicle and confirms with PO [REDACTED] whether the vehicle will be searched. For the duration of the footage (04:11 to 13:55), Mr.

█████ does not have any other conversation with PO █████ Mr. █████ never asks for PO █████ name at any point in the footage.

Mr. █████ who was in the driver's seat, stated that he asked PO █████ for her name before he was removed from the vehicle [Board Review 05].

On August 9, 2021, in a follow-up telephone call, Mr. █████ stated that he asked for PO █████ name when she asked for his documentation at the driver's side of the vehicle and when she returned to the vehicle. She did not provide her name to him [Board Review 06].

PO █████ testified that she did not recall Mr. █████ asking for her name during their interaction [Board Review 07].

PO █████ BWC footage captures her entire interaction with Mr. █████ by the driver's side. At no point in the footage does Mr. █████ ask for her name. As such, it is recommended that **Allegation A** be closed as **Unfounded**.

Allegation (B) Discourtesy: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer █████ spoke discourteously to █████

PO █████ BWC footage [Board Review 08] captures his entire interaction with Mr. █████ as the officers instruct Mr. █████ to exit his vehicle. From 04:27 to 04:45, PO █████ and PO Jendzo instruct Mr. █████ to step out of the car. PO █████ repeats his command. Mr. █████ asks the officers for an explanation. PO Jendzo states, "Because I asked you to." PO █████ asks Mr. █████ to step out. Mr. █████ continues to ask for an explanation as he exits the vehicle. PO █████ states, "You reek of weed, man." Mr. █████ states, "Reek of weed? What?" At no point in the footage does PO █████ or any officer by the driver's side door, use profanity toward Mr. █████ while asking him to exit the vehicle.

Mr. █████ stated that about three or four minutes after he spoke to PO █████ two marked SUVs arrived on scene. PO █████ approached the driver's side of Mr. █████ vehicle. PO █████ told Mr. █████ to get out of the vehicle approximately three times and used unspecified profanity while repeating his command. Mr. █████ asked, "For what? This is bullshit." PO █████ instructed Mr. █████ to open his door [Board Review 05].

During his second interview on September 1, 2021, PO █████ did not recall using any profanity while conversing with Mr. █████ [Board Review 09].

BWC footage from PO █████ captures his conversation with Mr. █████ as he is asking Mr. █████ to exit his vehicle. At no point in the footage does, PO █████ – or any officer – use any profanity while speaking to Mr. █████ As such, it is therefore recommended that **Allegation B** be closed as **Unfounded**.

Allegation (C) Force: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer █████ used physical force against █████

Allegation (D) Force: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer █████ hit █████ against a vehicle.

PO █████ BWC footage [Board Review 08] captures his interaction with Mr. █████ as PO Jendzo opens the driver's side door. From 04:30 to 04:46, PO █████ and PO Jendzo instruct Mr. █████ to step out of the vehicle three times. Mr. █████ asks the officers for an explanation. PO █████ appears to reach into Mr. █████ open driver's side door. His hands are not visible in the camera footage. It does not capture him reaching inside the vehicle and pulling Mr. █████ out by his shirt or arms. Mr. █████ steps out of the vehicle. PO █████ hand is briefly seen on Mr. █████ left arm as Mr. █████ steps out of the vehicle. PO █████ and PO Jendzo turn Mr. █████ around so that he is facing the vehicle.

PO Jendzo's BWC footage [Board Review 10] provides a better view of PO █████ hands as he interacts with Mr. █████ At 2:07, PO Jendzo opens Mr. █████ driver's side door. At 02:16, PO █████ asks Mr. █████ to step out of the car and reaches into the vehicle and holds onto Mr. █████ left arm as Mr. █████ exits the vehicle. Mr. █████ body is not pulled out of the car

forcefully, and Mr. [REDACTED] steps out and stands outside of the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo, using their arms to control Mr. [REDACTED] arms, turn him around so that his body is facing the middle of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle.

PO [REDACTED] BWC footage [Board Review 11] captures his perspective of PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo as the driver's side door is opened. PO [REDACTED] is behind PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo. From 2:13 to 2:16, PO [REDACTED] uses his left arm to reach in and hold Mr. [REDACTED] left hand. Mr. [REDACTED] steps out of the vehicle, but the view of him stepping out is obstructed by PO [REDACTED] back. Mr. [REDACTED] asks the officers to explain why he is being asked to step out. PO [REDACTED] says that Mr. [REDACTED] reeks of weed. At 2:18, the officers appear to be struggling with Mr. [REDACTED] based on an officer saying, "Don't make this worse." The view of the struggle is unclear because the camera is facing someone's back. At 2:30, handcuffs are placed on Mr. [REDACTED] wrists.

PO [REDACTED] BWC footage [Board Review 04] captures Mr. [REDACTED] as PO [REDACTED] walks over to the driver's side. From 05:06 to 05:13, officers place Mr. [REDACTED] against the middle of the vehicle as officers restrain him. None of the officers push him against the vehicle.

Mr. [REDACTED] stated that PO [REDACTED] asked him to get out of the vehicle approximately three times. PO [REDACTED] partially reached through the halfway rolled up window. He opened the unlocked door from the outside. PO [REDACTED] reached for Mr. [REDACTED] chest area of his shirt, using both hands to pull him out of the vehicle. Mr. [REDACTED] did not try to remain in the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] turned Mr. [REDACTED] around so that he was facing the driver's side of the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] while behind Mr. [REDACTED] told him to put his hands behind his back and was trying to pull his arms behind his back. Mr. [REDACTED] resisted by not bringing his hands to his back and keeping them to his sides because he was still holding the title deed and his phone, which he wanted to hand over to Ms. [REDACTED] [Board Review 05].

Ms. [REDACTED] who was initially seated in the passenger's seat, stated that PO [REDACTED] opened the driver's side door and pulled Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle by his shirt and left wrist. PO [REDACTED] turned Mr. [REDACTED] and pushed him against the vehicle chest first [Board Review 12].

PO [REDACTED] testified that he asked Mr. [REDACTED] to step out of the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] opened the door, and Mr. [REDACTED] stepped out on his own. He did not recall pulling Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle. He may have turned Mr. [REDACTED] around to rear handcuff Mr. [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] did not recall pushing Mr. [REDACTED] into the vehicle [Board Review 13].

PO Jendzo testified that he and PO [REDACTED] were by the driver's side of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. PO [REDACTED] opened the driver's side door by pulling the handle. PO Jendzo instructed Mr. [REDACTED] to exit the vehicle at least once. Mr. [REDACTED] asked the officers, "Why?" PO Jendzo and PO [REDACTED] told him, "Because we asked you to." Mr. [REDACTED] was not willingly stepping out of the car. He was defensive and holding onto the steering wheel and not complying with the officer's orders. PO Jendzo put his hand on Mr. [REDACTED] left arm to help him out of the vehicle. Mr. [REDACTED] stepped out of the car while the officers had their hands on him. Neither PO Jendzo nor PO [REDACTED] pulled Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle. Mr. [REDACTED] stepped out on his own.

When Mr. [REDACTED] was outside, PO Jendzo put his hand on Mr. [REDACTED] right arm. The officers closed the driver's side door. PO Jendzo turned Mr. [REDACTED] around so that he could be placed into handcuffs while holding onto his right arm. PO [REDACTED] was also turning Mr. [REDACTED] around by holding onto Mr. [REDACTED] left arm. Mr. [REDACTED] back was to PO Jendzo, and Mr. [REDACTED] was facing the middle of the vehicle. Mr. [REDACTED] body touched the vehicle, but the officers did not push him. As PO Jendzo was trying to handcuff him, Mr. [REDACTED] tensed up his arms, legs, and shoulders. He was bringing his arms to his chest, which PO Jendzo described as "turtling up." He tried to pull away from the officers toward the vehicle. PO Jendzo used firm grips on Mr. [REDACTED] arm and placed handcuffs on him. It took a few seconds to put handcuffs on Mr. [REDACTED] PO Jendzo did not see any other officer besides himself and PO [REDACTED] trying to handcuff Mr. [REDACTED] [Board Review 14].

Mr. [REDACTED] stated that PO [REDACTED] pulled him out of the vehicle. However, he did not allege that he was pushed into the vehicle. Ms. [REDACTED] stated that PO [REDACTED] pulled Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle and subsequently pushed him into the vehicle. However, the officers who were restraining

Mr. [REDACTED] did not testify that he was pulled or pushed into the vehicle. BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] PO Jendzo, PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] all of whom were by the driver's side, does not capture PO [REDACTED] or any officer using physical force to pull Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle or push him into it. As captured in BWC footage, PO [REDACTED] places his hand on Mr. [REDACTED] left arm, as if to guide him out, and Mr. [REDACTED] exits his vehicle on his own. At no point in the footage does any officer pull Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle or push him into it. It is therefore recommended that **Allegations C and D** be closed as **Unfounded**.

Allegation (E) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] damaged [REDACTED] property.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 08] captures Mr. [REDACTED] as he is being handcuffed. From 4:48 to 5:14, hands – it is unclear whose hands – are visible in the frame placing handcuffs on Mr. [REDACTED] who is holding onto a phone. It is unclear whether he is holding any papers. At 5:19, an officer says, "Let go of the phone." The footage does not capture PO [REDACTED] pulling at any papers or tearing any documents.

BWC footage from PO Jendzo [Board Review 10] provides a better view of the objects in Mr. [REDACTED] hands while the officers are handcuffing him. From 2:55 to 3:07, an officer instructs Mr. [REDACTED] to let go of his phone. White documents are visible in Mr. [REDACTED] clenched hands. At 3:07, a hand momentarily touches the papers and grabs it. It is unclear which officer touches the document. The footage does not capture any officer damaging the document.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 11] captures Mr. [REDACTED] hands clenching onto white papers as officers begin to handcuff him. From 02:28 to 02:39, Mr. [REDACTED] is holding onto a phone and white papers. A hand from an unknown officer tugs at them; much of the hand movements are unclear as the camera is close to Mr. [REDACTED] back. At 02:54, a male voice states, "Let go of the phone." At 03:05, Mr. [REDACTED] is still holding onto a crumpled piece of paper. The footage does not capture the paper leaving Mr. [REDACTED] hands or any damage sustained to these papers.

Mr. [REDACTED] stated that after PO [REDACTED] pulled Mr. [REDACTED] out of the vehicle, one of the officers ripped his paperwork in half while trying to place handcuffs on his wrists. Mr. [REDACTED] did not see how the officer ripped the document or who ripped the documents. The title and bill of sale were ripped as a result: the title is missing the bottom signature part, and the bill of sale is torn in the center [Board Review 05].

PO [REDACTED] testified that he did not recall Mr. [REDACTED] holding any papers while stepping out of the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] did not recall any officer handling Mr. [REDACTED] documents. PO [REDACTED] did not recall any objects in Mr. [REDACTED] hands, did not recall removing them, and denied pulling at any papers, causing them to rip or tear. During his CCRB interview, PO [REDACTED] was presented with his BWC footage [Board Review 08, time stamps 04:56 to 05:16]. PO [REDACTED] stated that his hands were likely pulling at Mr. [REDACTED] phone. Mr. [REDACTED] was not going to be able to take it with him because he was under arrest. The phone would be taken and safeguarded. PO [REDACTED] did not recall Mr. [REDACTED] holding any papers and did not see them in the video [Board Review 13].

PO Jendzo testified that he noticed papers and a phone in Mr. [REDACTED] left hand; he did not notice these objects while Mr. [REDACTED] was in the car. He did not notice when the objects left Mr. [REDACTED] hand. PO Jendzo denied removing the objects from Mr. [REDACTED] hands as he was controlling Mr. [REDACTED] right arm. Within a few seconds, PO [REDACTED] removed the objects from Mr. [REDACTED] hand. Mr. [REDACTED] tried to prevent PO [REDACTED] from removing the objects by holding onto them, squeezing the objects. PO Jendzo did not see the condition of the phone or the papers. PO Jendzo did not see PO [REDACTED] or any officer remove the papers, causing them to rip or tear [Board Review 14].

PO [REDACTED] testified that when she went to the driver's side, Mr. [REDACTED] was in handcuffs. PO [REDACTED] went to make sure that the handcuffs were secured, interacting with his arms. She did not recall him holding onto anything. PO [REDACTED] did not see any officer try to remove papers or documents from Mr. [REDACTED] hands [Board Review 07].

PO [REDACTED] who was near PO [REDACTED] by the driver's side, initially did not recall Mr. [REDACTED] holding any papers or documents or any officer pulling at the papers and damaging them. During his interview, he was presented with his BWC footage [Board Review 11, time stamps 2:10 to 2:57]. He believed there were papers and a phone in Mr. [REDACTED] hand. He could not tell whose hands were toward the left of the frame. He asked Mr. [REDACTED] to let go of his phone [Board Review 15].

PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] did not see PO [REDACTED] try to remove any objects from Mr. [REDACTED] hands [Board Review 16, 17].

On February 11, 2021, the investigation emailed Mr. [REDACTED] with a request for photographs of his damaged documents. To date, the investigation has not received photographs of the damaged documents [Board Review 18].

Mr. [REDACTED] alleged that officers damaged the title deed of his vehicle and bill of sale by tearing it; he did not provide the investigation any photographs of the alleged property damage. PO Jendzo testified that PO [REDACTED] removed the document and phone Mr. [REDACTED] was holding onto but did not recall PO [REDACTED] or any officer damaging any documents. PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] did not recall any officer removing and damaging any documents in Mr. [REDACTED] hands. BWC footage only captures an officer's hands from the left side of the frame, where PO [REDACTED] was standing, pulling at a piece of paper in Mr. [REDACTED] hand. None of the officers' footage captures any officer tearing the paper in Mr. [REDACTED] hands. A preponderance of the evidence suggests PO [REDACTED] pulled at the papers, but it is unclear whether his actions damaged the documents.

Absent video evidence depicting any action causing damage to the documents or photographs of the alleged damaged documents, the investigation cannot determine whether PO [REDACTED] damaged Mr. [REDACTED] documents. It is therefore recommended that **Allegation E** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation (F) Force: At Alameda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] used physical force against [REDACTED]

Cellphone footage recorded by Ms. [REDACTED] captures PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo restraining Mr. [REDACTED] outside of his vehicle. At 00:28, PO [REDACTED] the bald officer to the left of Mr. [REDACTED] raises his right foot a short distance upward and kicks Mr. [REDACTED] left leg by the ankle area [Board Review 19].

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 08] captures him restraining Mr. [REDACTED] From 5:27 to 5:48, PO [REDACTED] restrains Mr. [REDACTED] by the arms. Because the camera is close to Mr. [REDACTED] body, his legs are not captured in the frame. An officer – it is unclear which officer – states, “Do not kick. Stop trying to kick. Stop trying to kick us.”

BWC footage from PO Jendzo [Board Review 10] captures him restraining Mr. [REDACTED] outside of his vehicle. From 3:08 to 3:20, an officer states, “Do not kick.” PO Jendzo states, “Stop trying to kick us” twice. The footage does not capture Mr. [REDACTED] making any movements with his legs, depicting only his back at close range.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 11] similarly captures him by Mr. [REDACTED] back. It does not capture any officer kicking Mr. [REDACTED] From 2:56 to 3:20, officers can be heard instructing Mr. [REDACTED] to stop kicking. However, as PO [REDACTED] camera is close to Mr. [REDACTED] back, the leg movement from either the officers or Mr. [REDACTED] is not visible.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 04] captures the officers around Mr. [REDACTED] as he is outside of the vehicle. From 05:54 to 06:04, officers instruct Mr. [REDACTED] to stop kicking. The footage also does not capture Mr. [REDACTED] legs or any officers' legs kicking Mr. [REDACTED] capturing only the officers' backs.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 17] captures PO [REDACTED] walking over to the driver's side as Mr. [REDACTED] is removed from the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] goes to the left side of Mr. [REDACTED] standing behind PO [REDACTED] At 3:15, an officer asks Mr. [REDACTED] to let go of his phone. From 3:27 to 03:35, an officer instructs Mr. [REDACTED] to stop kicking three times. Only Mr. [REDACTED] face is visible in the footage; however, the officers and Mr. [REDACTED] struggle slightly. The lower part of Mr.

■■■■■ body is not in the footage, capturing neither Mr. ■■■■■ nor the officers' legs.

Mr. ■■■■■ stated that when officers removed him from the vehicle, Mr. ■■■■■ felt PO ■■■■■ trying to put his arms behind his back. Mr. ■■■■■ tried to keep his hands by his sides because he was holding onto his documents and phone. One of the officers by the driver's side kicked Mr. ■■■■■ on an unspecified part of his body [Board Review 05].

In a follow-up telephone call, Mr. ■■■■■ stated that an officer – he did not know which officer – used his foot to kick one of Mr. ■■■■■ legs by the ankle. It felt as if the officer was trying to take him down [Board Review 06].

Ms. ■■■■■ stated that once she exited the vehicle, she went over to the driver's side, where five officers had Mr. ■■■■■ pinned against the vehicle. One of the officers, described as a white male, used his right leg to kick Mr. ■■■■■ left leg, right below the calf, as if to move something [Board Review 12].

On April 20, 2021, PO ■■■■■ testified that he did not recall Mr. ■■■■■ trying to kick an officer. PO ■■■■■ denied kicking Mr. ■■■■■ PO ■■■■■ did not see PO Jendzo kick Mr. ■■■■■ leg. During his interview, PO ■■■■■ was presented with his BWC footage [05:16 to 05:30, Board Review 08]. He recognized himself say, "Stop trying to kick." PO ■■■■■ did not recall Mr. ■■■■■ trying to kick the officers, and he did not recall Mr. ■■■■■ kicking PO ■■■■■ [Board Review 13].

On September 1, 2021, PO ■■■■■ was interviewed again and presented cellphone video footage recorded by Ms. ■■■■■ [Board Review 19, timestamps 00:23 to 00:30]. PO ■■■■■ acknowledged that he kicked Mr. ■■■■■ to spread his legs out and gain control of him [Board Review 09].

PO Jendzo testified that a few seconds after Mr. ■■■■■ was handcuffed, Mr. ■■■■■ lifted his right leg and kicked PO Jendzo's foot and leg, kicking to the side and back. Mr. ■■■■■ was also kicking to the side and back with his left foot toward PO ■■■■■ Mr. ■■■■■ tried to kick once or twice between the two officers. Mr. ■■■■■ was still facing the vehicle; PO Jendzo stood at an angle, behind of Mr. ■■■■■ and bladed to the right of him while PO ■■■■■ was bladed to Mr. ■■■■■ left side. PO Jendzo did not want Mr. ■■■■■ to fall backwards or into the vehicle, so he used his right arm to control Mr. ■■■■■ When Mr. ■■■■■ put his foot down, PO Jendzo lifted his right leg and knee, and placed this leg next to Mr. ■■■■■ leg to prevent Mr. ■■■■■ leg from moving and to stop him from kicking PO Jendzo again. PO Jendzo did not pin his leg against Mr. ■■■■■ leg. PO Jendzo denied kicking Mr. ■■■■■ PO Jendzo did not see PO ■■■■■ kick Mr. ■■■■■ [Board Review 14].

PO ■■■■■ testified that PO Jendzo and PO ■■■■■ were holding onto Mr. ■■■■■ arms, trying to get him to stop kicking. By the time PO ■■■■■ went over, Mr. ■■■■■ was against the car, kicking backwards, a movement like a mule kick. Mr. ■■■■■ was kicking for about a second and kicking at no one in particular. PO Jendzo put his foot in between Mr. ■■■■■ legs to stop him from kicking backwards. PO Jendzo kept his foot there for a few seconds until Mr. ■■■■■ stopped kicking. PO ■■■■■ did not do anything else aside from holding onto Mr. ■■■■■ arm. PO ■■■■■ did not know if Mr. ■■■■■ feet struck either PO ■■■■■ or Jendzo. PO ■■■■■ did not see PO ■■■■■ kick Mr. ■■■■■ [Board Review 16].

PO ■■■■■ testified that he was to the left of PO ■■■■■ as the officers placed handcuffs on Mr. ■■■■■ Mr. ■■■■■ began to flail his legs, moving them back and kicking backwards. PO ■■■■■ instructed Mr. ■■■■■ to stop kicking once or twice. PO ■■■■■ did not know if Mr. ■■■■■ kicked PO ■■■■■ or any other officer. He did not see PO ■■■■■ or any officer kick Mr. ■■■■■ He did not see PO Jendzo use his feet to prevent Mr. ■■■■■ from kicking or recall any officer doing anything to prevent Mr. ■■■■■ from kicking [Board Review 15].

PO ■■■■■ did not recall hearing any officer say that Mr. ■■■■■ was kicking. No officer used their feet to kick Mr. ■■■■■ leg [Board Review 08].

PO ■■■■■ was presented his BWC [Board Review 20, timestamps 02:08 to 02:14]. He did not recall any officer try to kick Mr. ■■■■■ [Board Review 17].

Mr. ■■■■■ and Ms. ■■■■■ alleged that PO ■■■■■ kicked Mr. ■■■■■ by his lower leg area. PO Jendzo, PO ■■■■■ and PO ■■■■■ all of whom were near Mr. ■■■■■ as he was being handcuffed,

testified that Mr. [REDACTED] was kicking in a backwards motion toward the officers. PO Jendzo and PO [REDACTED] provided similar testimony: PO Jendzo was putting his feet near Mr. [REDACTED] leg to prevent him from kicking further. BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo captures officers instructing Mr. [REDACTED] to stop kicking, depicting mostly Mr. [REDACTED] back. PO [REDACTED] initially did not recall kicking Mr. [REDACTED] but when presented cellphone footage from Ms. [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] acknowledged that he kicked Mr. [REDACTED] by his foot area. Although cellphone footage captures PO [REDACTED] kicking Mr. [REDACTED] by his left lower leg area, none of the videos capture Mr. [REDACTED] kicking any officer.

Without further video evidence or information to depict Mr. [REDACTED] actions, the investigation cannot assess whether PO [REDACTED] kicking Mr. [REDACTED] was permissible. It is therefore recommended that **Allegation F** be closed as **Unsubstantiated**.

Allegation (G) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] was an occupant.

Allegation (H) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] was an occupant.

Allegation (I) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, officers searched the vehicle in which [REDACTED] was an occupant.

Allegation (J) Abuse of Authority: At Almeda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, in Queens, Police Officer [REDACTED] questioned [REDACTED]

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 04] captures her conversation with Mr. [REDACTED] at the driver's side. At 3:00, PO [REDACTED] tells Mr. [REDACTED] that he could go inside his home and smoke all the marijuana he wants. Her BWC footage also captures her search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle after officers place him into a police vehicle for transport. At 7:18, PO [REDACTED] searches the front passenger's side. She opens a paper McDonald's bag. At 7:32, PO [REDACTED] asks Ms. [REDACTED] for the location of the marijuana. She tells Ms. [REDACTED] that she can smell it. Ms. [REDACTED] says that she has some marijuana in her bag and that she and Mr. [REDACTED] smoked marijuana earlier. From 7:52 to 10:45, PO [REDACTED] feels around the center console area. She opens the glove compartment and closes it. She lifts a mat and feels under the front passenger's seat, reaching under the seat with her hands. She brushes aside litter on the floor. She opens and searches the glove compartment. At 10:18, PO [REDACTED] states that she found something on top of the window. The discovered object is not visible.

From 11:56 to 12:30 of PO [REDACTED] BWC footage [Board Review 04], PO [REDACTED] opens the left rear passenger's side door and peers into it with her flashlight. She goes to the driver's side and appears to feel around the floor area, her flashlight in her right hand. Her hands are not visible as her camera is pressed close against the bottom frame of the door. From 12:30 to 13:20, PO [REDACTED] searches the left rear passenger's side. Her hands are not entirely visible as she rummages through objects on the seat. At 13:20, PO [REDACTED] steps away from the door holding a circular, metallic object. The remainder of the footage does not capture PO [REDACTED] searching the trunk of the vehicle.

BWC footage from PO [REDACTED] [Board Review 09] captures PO [REDACTED] informing Mr. [REDACTED] that he "reeks of weed" as Mr. [REDACTED] exits his vehicle at the 4:36 mark. PO [REDACTED] footage also captures his search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. From 7:49 to 8:12, PO [REDACTED] goes to the open driver's side door and, with his left hand, feels a gap by the side of the door. He opens a small yellow piece of paper. At 8:13, PO [REDACTED] uses his flashlight to look through the closed window of the rear left passenger's side. At 10:16, PO [REDACTED] with his flashlight in his right hand, appears to be looking under the driver's side seat. His left hand reaches for the gap on the driver's side door. His hands are largely not visible in the frame.

BWC footage from PO Jendzo, PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and Sgt. [REDACTED] does not capture any officer opening and searching the trunk of the vehicle [Board Reviews 10, 20, 21, 23, 24].

Mr. [REDACTED] stated he did not smoke marijuana while operating the vehicle. In the cupholder was an ash tray that contained cigarette and marijuana ashes from an earlier event. Mr. [REDACTED] did not use marijuana inside the vehicle. Once officers removed Mr. [REDACTED] from the vehicle, PO [REDACTED] informed him that he was smoking marijuana in the vehicle. From the rear of the police vehicle, Mr. [REDACTED] saw officers, including PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] searching his vehicle. They were searching the front of the vehicle. He was not able to clearly see what the officers were searching from his position. Before he could see what else the officers were searching, he was transported away from the scene and brought to the 101st Precinct stationhouse [Board Review 05].

Ms. [REDACTED] stated that she let Mr. [REDACTED] park their vehicle. They used marijuana two hours prior to their arrival at Alameda Avenue and Beach 58th Street. There was no marijuana or contraband in the vehicle. However, Ms. [REDACTED] had a gram of marijuana inside her bag. When PO [REDACTED] spoke to Mr. [REDACTED] at the driver's side, she asked for his license and registration, but PO [REDACTED] did not mention marijuana. The officers removed Mr. [REDACTED] from the vehicle. Unidentified white male uniformed officers searched the driver's side, the glove compartment, center console compartment, and under the seats. They also searched the passenger's side. Two unidentified white male uniformed officers opened the trunk and may have moved a box but otherwise visually inspected the open trunk. On the sidewalk, an unidentified white male officer told Ms. [REDACTED] that the officers pulled them over because they saw them smoking in the car. One of the white male officers also told Ms. [REDACTED] that the officers smelled marijuana and asked her where it was. Ms. [REDACTED] admitted that she had marijuana in her bag [Board Review 12].

PO [REDACTED] testified that she searched Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle due to the odor of marijuana, which she observed during her initial approach of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. The strength of the odor intensified upon approach, coming from the vehicle's interior. She observed smoke as well. PO [REDACTED] did not recall PO [REDACTED] or any other officer searching the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] did not recall where she began her search. She did not recall where she looked, but she likely searched the glove compartment. She did not recall searching any bags. She searched the center console and under the driver's seat. She did not recall searching the trunk. PO [REDACTED] recovered marijuana and prepared vouchers for the marijuana, but she did not recall where she recovered it.

During her interview, PO [REDACTED] was presented with her BWC footage [Board Review 04]. PO [REDACTED] confirmed that she asked Ms. [REDACTED] "Where's the weed?" (timestamps 07:25 to 07:45). The question was for investigative purposes. The disc in PO [REDACTED] hand was a marijuana grinder, a tool used to grind up marijuana. The grinder was among the recovered evidence (timestamps 12:15 to 13:20) [Board Review 07].

PO [REDACTED] testified that when the officers drove by Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle, PO [REDACTED] observed the smell of marijuana and smoke coming from Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. When PO [REDACTED] approached the driver's side, he also smelled the strong odor of marijuana coming from the driver's side of the vehicle. After Mr. [REDACTED] was removed from the vehicle, PO [REDACTED] conducted a plain view search and only put his head into the two front seats to check for weapons. He was looking around the two front seats. PO [REDACTED] did not recall reaching into the vehicle and looking into any parts of it. PO [REDACTED] searched the vehicle and recovered marijuana and vouchered it. He did not see the evidence other than PO [REDACTED] carrying plastic bags that were put into a narcotics envelope. PO [REDACTED] did not recall any other officer searching the vehicle. PO [REDACTED] did not believe the trunk was searched. During his CCRB interview, PO [REDACTED] was presented with his BWC footage [Board Review 08]. PO [REDACTED] was looking into the inside of the vehicle. There were marijuana rolling papers by the door handle (timestamps 07:45 to 08:07). PO [REDACTED] did not recall looking into any other part of the vehicle aside from the door [Board Review 13].

PO Jendzo observed a smoky haze in the entire cabin of vehicle. The area smelled of smoked marijuana that was coming from the interior of the vehicle. The odor smelled like smoked marijuana coming from the interior of the vehicle. PO Jendzo later learned that PO [REDACTED] recovered a plastic vial of plant-like substance consistent with marijuana [Board Review 13].

PO [REDACTED] did not recall smelling marijuana, but he heard an officer say that the car smelled

of marijuana [Board Review 16].

Sgt. [REDACTED] testified that he smelled marijuana coming from Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. He did not recall how strong the odor was. He did not recall whether the trunk of the vehicle was searched. During his interview, he was presented with his BWC footage [Board Review 24, timestamps 09:52 to 10:02]. He stated that PO [REDACTED] was picking up a jar of marijuana. The recovered marijuana was vouchered [Board Review 25].

PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] did not recall smelling marijuana [Board Reviews 15, 17]

Vouchers prepared by PO [REDACTED] indicate that one multicolored cylinder containing marijuana residue, alleged marijuana, and one grinder containing marijuana residue were vouchered as arrest evidence [Board Review 26].

The smell of marijuana smoke alone can provide police officers with probable cause to search and automobile and its occupants, People v. Chestnut, 43 A.D.2d 260, 261 (1974) [Board Review 22].

Mr. [REDACTED] Ms. [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and several officers provided consistent testimony indicating that there was marijuana inside Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. Furthermore, vouchers prepared by PO [REDACTED] indicate that marijuana and related marijuana paraphernalia were recovered as arrest evidence. As per People v. Chestnut, the odor of marijuana emanating from the vehicle allowed PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] to search Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. Although Ms. [REDACTED] alleged that the trunk was searched, and no officers' BWC footage captures the alleged search of the trunk, a subsequent search of the trunk would be permissible as well. Under the automobile exception outlined in People v. Chestnut, PO [REDACTED] and PO [REDACTED] search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle was permissible. It is recommended that **Allegations G, H, and I** be closed as **Exonerated**.

As captured in BWC footage, PO [REDACTED] questioned Ms. [REDACTED] about the whereabouts of the marijuana while PO [REDACTED] was conducting a search of Mr. [REDACTED] vehicle. Given that PO [REDACTED] was searching the vehicle as per People v. Chestnut, her questioning of Ms. [REDACTED] an occupant of the vehicle, was permissible as part of her investigation into the odor of marijuana. It is recommended that **Allegation K** be **Exonerated**.

Allegation (K) Abuse of Authority: At Alameda Avenue and Beach 58th Street, Police Officer [REDACTED] failed to provide [REDACTED] with a business card.

Ms. [REDACTED] stated that one of the male uniformed officers told Ms. [REDACTED] that the officers smelled marijuana and asked her where the marijuana was located. She did not receive a business card from any officer [Board Review 12].

PO [REDACTED] testified that she likely did not provide a business card to Ms. [REDACTED] During her CCRB interview, PO [REDACTED] was presented her BWC footage [Board Review 04, timestamps 07:25 to 07:45]. She acknowledged questioning Ms. [REDACTED] and asking her, "Where's the weed?" PO [REDACTED] explained that the question was for investigative purposes.

NYPD Administrative Guide 304-11 provides guidelines on the issuance of business cards to members of the public during law enforcement activities. Members of service must provide business cards during non-custodial questioning of individuals suspected of criminal activity, except when the individuals receive a summons or are arrested [Board Review 27].

PO [REDACTED] questioned Ms. [REDACTED] during an interaction in which only the driver, Mr. [REDACTED] received summonses. As such, PO [REDACTED] was required to provide Ms. [REDACTED] with a business card. It is therefore recommended that **Allegation L** be **Substantiated**.

Allegation (L) Abuse of Authority: At the 101st Precinct stationhouse, Police Officer [REDACTED] refused to provide her name to [REDACTED]

Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he was at the 101st Precinct stationhouse for about an hour and a half. PO [REDACTED] came to Mr. [REDACTED] and told him that Ms. [REDACTED] was coming to get him. She issued three summonses to Mr. [REDACTED] Mr. [REDACTED] asked for her name [Board Review 05].

In a follow-up telephone call, Mr. [REDACTED] stated that he asked PO [REDACTED] for her name in

the lobby area of the stationhouse. She told him that her name was on the summons. Mr. [REDACTED] could not read it because it was in script [Board Review 06].

PO [REDACTED] testified she issued Mr. [REDACTED] summonses at the stationhouse. She did not recall Mr. [REDACTED] asking for her name at the stationhouse [Board Review 07].

The three summonses Mr. [REDACTED] received from PO [REDACTED] have her name written legibly [Board Reviews 01, 02, 03].

NYPD Administrative Guide 304-11 provides guidelines for members of service who interact with members of the public and conclude law enforcement activities, except in cases when a summons or an arrest is made. These guidelines indicate that members of service must otherwise provide their name to anyone who requests that they do so [Board Review 27].

Although PO [REDACTED] did not recall Mr. [REDACTED] asking for her name at the stationhouse, each of the summonses she issued to Mr. [REDACTED] contain her name written in print. Given that PO [REDACTED] issued Mr. [REDACTED] summonses, and was not required to provide her name as per Administrative Guide 304-11, it is therefore recommended that **Allegation L** be closed as **Exonerated**.

Allegation (M) Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Sergeant [REDACTED] failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.

Allegation (N) Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Police Officer [REDACTED] failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.

Allegation (O) Other Possible Misconduct Noted: Police Officer Philip Jendzo failed to prepare a memo book entry as required.

Sgt. [REDACTED] did not prepare any memo book entry pertaining to this incident. He explained that he forgot to create any memo book entries [Board Review 25].

PO [REDACTED] did not prepare any memo book entries related to this incident. He explained that he did not get a chance to prepare memo book entries because he had to leave the scene quickly. He did not know if he was required to prepare memo book entries for assisting another unit [Board Review 15].

PO Jendzo did not prepare any memo book entries related to this incident. He explained that he was assisting another unit [Board Review 14].

According to Patrol Guide Procedure 212-08, officers, below the rank of captain, are required to prepare memo book entries for each tour of duty, including assignments received, information pertinent to an assignment (i.e., action taken, narrative disposition, forms prepared with identifying serial number, etc.) to include the name, rank, shield number and command of off-duty uniformed member(s) of the service involved in any off-duty incident, and tasks performed. Officers must make entries recording enforcement actions [Board Review 20].

Because Sgt. [REDACTED] PO [REDACTED] and PO Jendzo responded to the scene to assist officers at the scene of the vehicle stop and failed to make memo book entries related to this response, it is recommended that **Allegation D** result in **Other Possible Misconduct Noted**.

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- This is the first complaint of which [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] have been parties [Board Review 29, 30]
- PO [REDACTED] has been a member-of-service for two years. She is a subject officer in five other complaints and five other allegations:
 - Case # 202002009 was closed pending litigation.
 - Case # 202002061 is awaiting board panel review.
 - Case # 202100127 was closed as complaint withdrawn.
 - Case # 202100427 is awaiting board panel review.
 - Case # 202102756 involves allegations of gun drawn and gun pointed. This complaint was closed as complainant uncooperative.

• PO [REDACTED] [REDACTED] has been a member-of-service for 26 years. He has 13 complaints, and 38 allegations filed against him. None of these allegations have been substantiated. There are no applicable patterns.

- Case # 202002061 involves an allegation of a Vehicle Search. This complaint is awaiting board panel review.
- Case # 202105125 involves an allegation of Force. This case is under active investigation.

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- This case was not eligible for mediation.
- On April 5, 2021, the Office of the New York City Comptroller indicated that there was a Notice of Claim filed related to this incident. Mr. [REDACTED] claims that he was deprived of his constitutional rights, subjected to an illegal arrest, physical contact, and illegal confinement [Board Review 31]. On October 14, 2021, the Office of the New York City Comptroller indicated that the 50-H hearing for this incident was adjourned until November 1, 2021[Board Review 32].
- According to the Office of Court Administration (OCA), Mr. [REDACTED] and Ms. [REDACTED] have no prior conviction history in New York City [Board Review 33, 34].

Squad No.: 11

Investigator: _____	Inv. Mike Talisayan _____	11/08/2021 _____
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Squad Leader: <u>Edwin Pena</u>	IM Edwin Pena _____	11/09/21 _____
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date

Reviewer: _____	_____	_____
Signature	Print Title & Name	Date